

## MYRTLE BEACH HIGH

3302 Robert Grissom Parkway  
Myrtle Beach, SC 29577

**GRADES** 9-12 High School

**ENROLLMENT** 1,104 Students

**PRINCIPAL** Nona Kerr 843-448-7149

**SUPERINTENDENT** Gerrita Postlewait 843-488-6700

**BOARD CHAIR** Will Garland 843-358-8002

## THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

### ANNUAL SCHOOL REPORT CARD

# 2003

#### ABSOLUTE RATING:

**GOOD**

Absolute Ratings of High Schools with Students like Ours

Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
14	14	5	0	0

#### IMPROVEMENT RATING:

**BELOW AVERAGE**

The school's Improvement rating was raised one level because of substantial improvement in the achievement of students belonging to historically underachieving groups of students.

#### ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS:

**N/A**

#### SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE GOAL

By 2010, South Carolina's student achievement will be ranked in the top half of the states nationally. To achieve this goal, we must become one of the fastest improving systems in the country.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION, VISIT WEBSITES AT:**

**[WWW.MYSCSCHOOLS.COM](http://WWW.MYSCSCHOOLS.COM)**

**[WWW.SCEOC.ORG](http://WWW.SCEOC.ORG)**

**PERFORMANCE TRENDS OVER 4-YEAR PERIOD**

	Absolute Rating	Improvement Rating	Adequate Yearly Progress
2001	Good	Excellent	N/A
2002	Excellent	Average	N/A
2003	Good	Below Average	N/A
2004			

**TENTH GRADE PASSAGE OF ONE OR MORE SUBTESTS OF THE EXIT EXAM**

	Our School			High Schools with Students Like Ours		
Percent	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
Passed all 3 subtests	76.0	67.1	67.3	70.5	66.9	69.0
Passed 2 subtests	16.3	18.3	16.5	15.6	17.4	17.3
Passed 1 subtest	5.3	7.9	9.8	8.8	10.1	8.5
Passed no subtests	2.4	6.7	6.3	5.1	5.6	4.8

**PERFORMANCE BY STUDENT GROUPS**

	Exit Exam Passage Rate by Spring 2003		Eligibility for LIFE Scholarships*		Graduation Rate	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>All Students</b>	228	98.7	228	13.2	247	78.1
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	104	96.2	105	13.3	116	71.6
Female	123	100.8	123	13.0	131	84.0
<b>Race or Ethnic Group</b>						
African American	37	97.3	54	0.0	56	66.1
Hispanic	3	I/S	9	0.0	9	55.6
White	187	98.9	161	18.6	179	83.2
Other	N/A	N/A	4	I/S	3	I/S
<b>Disability Status</b>						
Non-speech disabilities	56	91.1	32	0.0	37	29.7
Students without disabilities	172	101.2	196	15.3	210	86.7
<b>Migrant Status</b>						
Migrant	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Non-migrant	227	98.7	228	13.2	0	N/A
<b>English Proficiency</b>						
Limited English proficient	3	I/S	11	0.0	9	99.0
Non-LEP	225	98.7	217	13.8	237	76.8
<b>Lunch Status</b>						
Subsidized meals	52	98.1	62	0.0	56	99.0
Full-pay meals	176	98.9	166	18.1	191	68.6

n = number of students on which percentage is calculated

**ELIGIBILITY FOR LIFE SCHOLARSHIPS**

Percent of	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
Seniors eligible for LIFE Scholarships at four-year institutions*	13.2	14.7
Seniors who met the SAT requirement	14.9	15.6
Seniors who met the grade point average	54.8	53.3

\*Using only the SAT and grade point average requirements

SCHOOL PROFILE

	Our School	Change from Last Year	High Schools with Students Like Ours	Median High School
Students (n= 1,104)				
Retention rate	2.7%	Down from 10.9%	6.6%	7.3%
Attendance rate	96.0%	Up from 95.9%	95.4%	95.5%
Eligible for gifted and talented	12.6%	No change	6.3%	5.1%
With disabilities other than speech	13.9%	Up from 12.7%	11.9%	12.2%
Older than usual for grade	7.8%	Down from 8.1%	9.5%	10.1%
Suspended or expelled	4.1%	Up from 3.1%	3.5%	2.3%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs	7.7%	N/A	N/A	10.2%
Successful on AP/IB exams	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Annual dropout rate	3.0%	Up from 0.0%	3.0%	2.7%
Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations	1.7%	Down from 1.8%	0.4%	3.2%
Enrollment in career/technology center courses	574	Down from 576	466	433
Students participating in worked-based experiences	23.0%	Up from 8.8%	32.8%	26.3%
Career/technology students mastering core competencies	71.0%	Down from 80.6%	76.1%	74.9%
Career/technology completers placed	N/A	N/A	100.0%	99.5%

Teachers (n= 69)				
Teachers with advanced degrees	39.1%	Up from 36.4%	55.6%	51.7%
Continuing contract teachers	88.4%	Up from 87.9%	84.8%	81.8%
Highly qualified teachers	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Teachers returning from previous year	88.1%	Up from 85.9%	87.1%	85.1%
Teacher attendance rate	96.4%	Down from 96.8%	96.3%	95.8%
Average teacher salary	\$42,886	Up 2.0%	\$41,034	\$40,303
Prof. development days/teacher	7.7 days	Down from 9.2 days	9.3 days	10.3 days

School				
Principal's years at school	1.0	Down from 4.0	3.0	3.0
Student-teacher ratio	28.4 to 1	Up from 26.9 to 1	27.7 to 1	26.2 to 1
Prime instructional time	91.4%	Down from 92.0%	90.4%	90.1%
Dollars spent per pupil*	\$6,411	Down 7.3%	\$6,267	\$6,279
Percent spent on teacher salaries*	57.1%	Up from 54.8%	57.9%	57.8%
Opportunities in the arts	Good	Down from Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Parents attending conferences	97.5%	Up from 45.6%	78.8%	87.8%
SACS accreditation	yes	N/A	yes	yes

\* Prior year audited financial data are reported.

	Our District	State
Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools	N/A	N/A
Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools	N/A	N/A

Abbreviations for Missing Data							
N/A	Not Applicable	N/C	Not Collected	N/R	Not Reported	I/S	Insufficient Sample

**REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL**

This has been a year of transition at Myrtle Beach High School, but our students, faculty, staff, and community met the educational challenges. The 2002-2003 school year began with MBHS receiving its second Palmetto Gold Award for outstanding academic performance. Our clubs and organizations continued their community involvement through fundraising and service projects. Our career programs placed many students in internships and work-related activities. Along with these partnerships, our accomplishments include the following:

Members of the senior class were offered over \$3.2 million in scholarships, with over 80% (self-reported) of those seniors planning to attend two- or four-year colleges or universities. We, again, had a National Merit Scholar semi-finalist and eleven students named as Palmetto Fellows. Our SAT, Math, and Academic Teams were strong competitors both locally and regionally. We led Horry County in regional science fair winners and we had one student to qualify for the International Science Fair. Along with our academic accomplishments, we also captured two state championships (girls and boys tennis) and one lower state championship (boys soccer).

Our faculty and staff continued their efforts to improve instructional strategies to ensure that students would meet the state standards. Benchmark tests were created; pullout programs were utilized; and tutorial programs were offered to assist all students in meeting performance goals. We completed our Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) five-year process meeting all requirements. One of our teachers was awarded the Fullbright Scholarship and will be traveling to Japan to share educational ideas in art.

Our academic focus this year was with rising ninth grade students who scored basic or below on the eighth grade PACT and rising tenth graders struggling in the areas of math and English. In the upcoming year, we will search for patterns linked to educational successes and failures and diligently plan for support in these areas of need. An Adopt-A-Seahawk program will place each MBHS teacher with students not meeting standards in order to provide additional encouragement and assistance.

We will continue to rely on our PTSO, School Improvement Council, Parent Forum, and Local Advisory Board for input concerning improvement in school-community relations, parent involvement, and academic performance.

Nona Kerr, Principal

**EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS**

	<b>Teachers</b>	<b>Students</b>	<b>Parents</b>
<b>Number of surveys returned</b>	72	185	41
<b>Percent satisfied with learning environment</b>	93.0%	73.2%	75.6%
<b>Percent satisfied with social and physical environment</b>	88.7%	81.0%	77.5%
<b>Percent satisfied with home-school relations</b>	70.4%	87.4%	80.5%

**DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS**

- **Excellent** - School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- **Good** - School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- **Average** - School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- **Below Average** - School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- **Unsatisfactory** - School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal

**DEFINITION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS**

As required by the United States Department of Education, adequate yearly progress specified that the statewide target is met for all students and for each subgroup of students: racial/ethnic, economic, disability, limited English proficiency and migrant status.